

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the above-identified application.

Issues Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to satisfy "enablement" requirements.

As indicated above, claims 1, 13 and 16 have been amended so as to change "voltage application process" to read --voltage treatment with the use of an electrode--. It is submitted that this language is supported by the disclosure of the present application. Note, for example, the description of the apparatus shown in Figure 1 at page 30 of the present specification which includes an electrode set 5a. Therefore, it is submitted that all of the present claims of this application satisfy all applicable requirements under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, including enablement requirements, such that the above-noted rejection should be withdrawn.

Request for Reconsideration of Unity of Invention Requirement

The Office Action of March 8, 2004 includes a "Restriction Requirement" under 35 U.S.C. 121. It is respectfully submitted

that the present application was filed under 35 U.S.C. 371 which entitles the applicant to rights under the "Unity of Invention" procedures. Presently apparatus claims 20-24 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Elected claims 1-19 are directed to a resin molded product which has been subjected to a voltage treatment with the use of an electrode. Similarly, claims 20-24 are directed to an apparatus which employs an electrode to form a resin molded product within the scope of claims 1-19. Therefore, it is submitted that these two groups of claims share unity of invention. In this regard, it is submitted that the present situation is similar to the relationship between claims 1 and 4 in Example 6 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT, Annex B, Part 2, page AI-68 of the MPEP (Rev. 1, February 2003), a copy of which is attached.

Conclusion

It is submitted for the reasons stated above that the present claims define patentable subject matter such that this application should now be placed condition for allowance.

If any questions arise regarding the above matters, please contact Applicant's representative, Andrew D. Meikle (Reg. No.

32,868), in the Washington Metropolitan Area at the phone number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

Andrew D. Meikle, #32,868

ADM:gmh

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

Attachment: Administrative Instructions under the PCT, Annex B, Part 2, page AI-68 of the MPEP (Rev. 1, February 2003)

[ANNEX B, CONTINUED]

PART 2

EXAMPLES CONCERNING UNITY OF INVENTION

The application of the principles of unity of invention is illustrated by the following examples for guidance in particular cases.

I. CLAIMS IN DIFFERENT CATEGORIES

Example 1

Claim 1: A method of manufacturing chemical substance X.

Claim 2: Substance X.

Claim 3: The use of substance X as an insecticide.

Unity exists between claims 1, 2 and 3. The special technical feature common to all the claims is substance X.

Example 2

Claim 1: A process of manufacture comprising steps A and B.

Claim 2: Apparatus specifically designed for carrying out step A.

Claim 3: Apparatus specifically designed for carrying out step B.

Unity exists between claims 1 and 2 or between claims 1 and 3. There is no unity between claims 2 and 3 since there exists no common special technical feature between the two claims.

Example 3

Claim 1: A process for painting an article in which the paint contains a new rust inhibiting substance X including the steps of atomizing the paint using compressed air, electrostatically charging the atomized paint using a novel electrode arrangement A and directing the paint to the article.

Claim 2: A paint containing substance X.

Claim 3: An apparatus including electrode arrangement A.

Unity exists between claims 1 and 2 where the common special technical feature is the paint containing substance X or between claims 1 and 3 where the common special technical feature is the electrode arrangement A.

However, unity is lacking between claims 2 and 3 since there exists no common special technical feature between them.

Example 4

Claim 1: Use of a family of compounds X as insecticides.

Claim 2: Compound X_1 belonging to family X.

Provided X_1 has the insecticidal activity and the special technical feature in claim 1 is the insecticidal use, unity is present.

MANUAL OF PATENT EXAMINING PROCEDURE

Example 5

- Claim 1: A process for treating textiles comprising spraying the material with a particular coating composition under special conditions (e.g., as to temperature, irradiation).
- Claim 2: A textile material coated according to the process of claim 1.
- Claim 3: A spraying machine for use in the process of claim 1 and characterized by a new nozzle arrangement providing a better distribution of the composition being sprayed.

The process according to claim 1 imparts unexpected properties to the product of claim 2.

The special technical feature in claim 1 is the use of special process conditions corresponding to what is made necessary by the choice of the particular coating. Unity exists between claims 1 and 2.

The spraying machine in claim 3 does not correspond to the above identified special technical feature. Unity does not exist between claim 3 and claims 1 and 2.

Example 6

- Claim 1: A fuel burner with tangential fuel inlets into a mixing chamber.
- Claim 2: A process for making a fuel burner including the step of forming tangential fuel inlets into a mixing chamber.
- Claim 3: A process for making a fuel burner including casting step A.
- Claim 4: An apparatus for carrying out a process for making a fuel burner including feature X resulting in the formation of tangential fuel inlets.
- Claim 5: An apparatus for carrying out a process for making a fuel burner including a protective housing B.
- Claim 6: A process of manufacturing carbon black including the step of tangentially introducing fuel into a mixing chamber of a fuel burner.

Unity exists between claims 1, 2, 4, and 6. The special technical feature common to all the claims is the tangential fuel inlets. Claims 3 and 5 lack unity with claims 1, 2, 4, and 6 since claims 3 and 5 do not include the same or corresponding special technical feature as set forth in claims 1, 2, 4, and 6. Claims 3 and 5 would also lack unity with one another.

Example 7

- Claim 1: A high corrosion resistant and high strength ferritic stainless steel strip consisting essentially of, in percent by weight: Ni=2.0-5.0; Cr=15-19; Mo=1-2; and the balance Fe having a thickness of between 0.5 and 2.0 mm and a 0.2% yield strength in excess of 50 kg/mm squared.
- Claim 2: A method of producing a high corrosion resistant and high strength ferritic stainless steel strip consisting essentially of, in percent by weight: Ni=2.0-5.0; Cr=15-19; Mo=1-2; and the balance Fe, comprising the steps of: hot rolling to a thickness between 2.0 and 5.0 mm; annealing the hot rolled strip at 800-1000 degrees C under substantially no oxidizing conditions; cold rolling the strip to a thickness of between 0.5 and 2.0 mm; and final annealing the cold rolled strip at between 1120 and 1200 degrees C for a period of 2-5 minutes.

Unity exists between product claim 1 and process claim 2. The special technical feature in the product claim is the 0.2% yield strength in excess of 50 kg/mm squared. The process steps in claim 2 inherently produce a ferritic stainless steel strip with a 0.2% yield strength in excess of 50 kg/mm squared. Even if this feature is